

WITTENBERG CALVINIZANS: THE INVOLVEMENT OF MELANCHTHON, PEUCER, AND EBER IN THE BREMEN SACRAMENTARIAN CONTROVERSY, 1560¹

W. JANSE

"Ich will ihn pro damnato halten" (I wish to regard him as damned), were the words Luther used to an unsuspecting Melanchthon in order to pillory the Strasbourg reformer Martin Bucer in August 1544.² The statement was a reaction to the un-Lutheran paragraph on the Lord's Supper in Bucer's Cologne Church Order of 1543.³ The fact that Luther's furious outburst revealed unconsciously and indirectly the heterodoxy of Bucer's co-author — Melanchthon himself — knocked the ground from under Melanchthon's feet, it is true,⁴ but it established a historical fact: the Wittenberg Faculty of Theology did not have a homogeneous doctrine of the Lord's Supper.⁵

- 1 An earlier version of this article was presented as a paper at the 1995 Sixteenth Century Studies Conference, San Francisco, California, October 26, 1995. Travel for this paper was supported by the Stichting Leids Universiteits-Fonds. I am indebted to M.J. Collins (Gremlin Editorial Services, Donkerbroek) for his linguistic assistance. Abbreviations in the notes correspond to G. Müller, ed., *Theologische Realenzyklopädie: Abkürzungsverzeichnis* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994²).
- 2 Hieronymus Besold to Veit Dietrich in Nuremberg, August 8, 1544, in O. Albrecht/P. Flemming, eds., "Das sogenannte Manuscriptum Thomasianum", in *ARG* 13 (1916): 164.
- 3 Martin Bucer, *Von Gottes genaden unser Hermans Ertzbischoffs zu Cöln, unnd Churfürsten etc. einfaltigs bedenken, warauff ein Christliche, in dem wort Gottes gegründte Reformation (...) anzurichten seye* [Bonn: Laurentius von der Müllen, 1543], 93^b-111^a; H. Gerhards/W. Borth, transl./eds., *Hermann von Wied: Einfältiges Bedenken. Reformationsentwurf für das Erzstift Köln von 1543* (SVRKG 43) (Düsseldorf: Presseverband der Evangelischen Kirche im Rheinland, 1972), 139-164. As to Luther's criticism of the Eucharistic doctrine of the *Einfaltigs bedenken*: M. Köhn, *Martin Bucers Entwurf einer Reformation des Erzstiftes Köln. Untersuchung der Entstehungsgeschichte und der Theologie des 'Einfältigen Bedenckens' von 1543* (UKG 2) (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1966), 124f.
- 4 Besold to Dietrich, August 8, 1544, in *ARG* 13 (1916): 164: "Id cum significasset Domino Philippo post suam praelectionem, sensi eum admodum perturbari". W.H. Neuser set out the confrontation in his *Luther und Melanchthon—Einheit im Gegensatz. Ein Beitrag zum Melanchthon-Jubiläum 1960* (TEH 91) (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961), 25-34; idem, "Die Versuche Bullingers, Calvins und der Strassburger, Melanchthon zum Fortgang von Wittenberg zu bewegen", in U. Gäbler/E. Herkenrath, eds., *Heinrich Bullinger 1504-1575. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 400. Todestag* 2 (ZBRG 8) (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1975): 36-39.
- 5 Cf. Neuser, *Luther und Melanchthon*, 21-24; idem, *Die Abendmahlslehre Melanchthons in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung (1519-1530)* (BGLRK 26/2) (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1968), 273-277, 339-398; R.W. Quere, "Melanchthonian Motifs in the Formula's Eucharistic Christology", in L.W. Spitz/W. Lohff, eds., *Discord, Dialogue, and Concord: Studies in the Lutheran Reformation's Formula of Concord* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977): 58-

(continued...)

Wilhelm Neuser has traced Melanchthon's dissociation from Luther's materialistic conception of the real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament from 1543.⁶ According to Neuser, the final point of the development of Melanchthon's doctrine — which can be regarded as a paradigm for his Faculty — is his spiritualistic description of the elements of the Lord's Supper, in March 1559, as *συμβολὰ* and *ἀντίτυπα*, thereby coming close to the Swiss point of view.⁷

The Wittenberg Faculty, however, took up an even more un-Lutheran position in two documents dating from the year of Melanchthon's death, 1560. Initially, I consulted them in manuscript, anonymous apographs preserved in the *Archives Municipales de Strasbourg, Archives du Chapitre de Saint Thomas* (AMS, AST). The first provides a review of the interpretations of the words of the institution from Paul to Westphal.⁸ An extract can be found in the notes from Melanchthon's secret sermons, made by his son-in-law Caspar Peucer in January 1561 and published in the *Corpus Reformatorum*.⁹ There is also remarkable agreement with Melanchthon's writing on the Lord's Supper for Frederick III of the Palatinate, the *Iudicium* of November 1st, 1559.¹⁰ The second document, entitled *De coena Domini*, attacks the ontic concept of the real presence and ubiquity as its presupposition.¹¹ Both documents were catalogued as products of Melanchthon's pen.¹² The first text, however, is the extract from an undated letter of Peucer to Ulrich Mordeisen, published in

5 (...continued)

73; C. Andresen, ed., *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte* 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 79-81.

6 W.H. Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre und ihre Auswirkung im unteren Donaauraum", in *ZKG* 1 (1973): 49-59.

7 Melanchthon to Crato von Crafftheim, March 21, 1559, in *CR* 9: 785; Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre", 57.

8 AMS, AST 181/10, 99^r-101^r.

9 "De sacra coena", in *CR* 9: 1088-1090, esp. 1089f. sub III.

10 Melanchthon, "Iudicium de controversia de coena Domini", in *CR* 9: 960-963 and R. Stupperich, ed., *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl* 6 (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1955): 482-486 (abbr. as *MWA*).

11 AMS, AST 181/10, 101^v-108^v: "De coena Domini".

12 J. Adam, *Inventaire des Archives du Chapitre de St-Thomas de Strasbourg* (Strasbourg: Imprimerie Alsacienne, 1937), 311: "Melanchthon Alberto Hardenbergo, de coena domini". Cf. the annotation by J. Rott in his copy of Adam's *Inventaire*, 311: "probablement de Melanchthon". In his *Inventaire supplémentaire dactylographié* [Strasbourg, n.d.], Rott did not mention the folio's in question. Erroneously, I assumed the Melanchthonian authorship in my *Albert Hardenberg als Theologe. Profil eines Bucer-Schülers* (SHCT 57) (Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1994), 80, 303, 308, as did J.V. Pollet, *Martin Bucer. Études sur les relations de Bucer avec les Pays-Bas, l'Électorat de Cologne et l'Allemagne du Nord avec de nombreux textes inédits* 1 (SMRT 33) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985), 276 note 6.

1596, and the second is the Confession on the Supper by Paul Eber, Melancthon's friend and colleague, of December 28th, 1560, edited in 1575.¹³

In the present contribution, firstly, I would like to show how Wittenberg became increasingly involved in the sacramentarian controversy surrounding the institute's protégé, the Bremen reformer Albert Hardenberg,¹⁴ disciple of Martin Bucer and friend to the Swiss. Secondly, I would like to demonstrate how, in the conflict, the two Wittenberg professors Peucer and Eber¹⁵ took a Genevan standpoint by embracing Calvin's Eucharistic doctrine on two essential points in 1560, one of them even quoting, anonymously, Calvin's unionistic *Petit traité de la sainte cene* of 1541.¹⁶ Since Wittenberg played a key role in the process of reformed confessionalization in Northern Germany,¹⁷ in this article I will be highlighting the influence of Calvin in 1560 —

13 Caspar Peucer to Ulrich Mordeisen, [n.d.], in Caspar Peucer, *Tractatus historicus de claris. viri Philip. Melanthonis sententia, De Controversia Coenae Domini* (...) (Ambergae: Michael Forster, 1596): 105-108; Eber's confession: "Iudicium de Coena Domini, Pastoris Ecclesiae Wittenbergensis D. Pauli Eberi, Electori Saxoniae Augusto, die 28. Decemb. Anni 61. [sic] oblatum Dresdae in Misnia, prope Albim", in Joachim Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua et ferme integra controversiae de sacra coena* (...) (Heidelbergae: Johann Mayer, 1575): 292-311. I owe this information to Dr. Walther Thüringer (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Melancthon-Forschungsstelle Heidelberg), who identified both documents.

14 As to him: Janse, *Hardenberg*.

15 As to Caspar Peucer (1525-1602): E.L.Th. Henke, *Caspar Peucer und Nicolaus Krell. Zur Geschichte des Lutherthums und der Union am Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Marburg: N.G. Elwert'sche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1865); R. Kolb, *Caspar Peucer's Library: Portrait of a Wittenberg Professor of the Mid-Sixteenth Century* (Sixteenth Century Bibliography 5) (St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1976); Janse, *Hardenberg*, index, and 535 (Peucer's correspondence with Hardenberg); biographical articles in *ADB* 25 (1887): 552-556; *RE*³ 15 (1904): 228-231; *RGK* 5 (1961, repr. 1986): 264; *LThK* 8 (1963): 390; H.J. Hillerbrand et al., eds., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) 3: 251f. (abbr. as *OER*). As to Paul Eber (1511-1569): C.H. Sixt, *Dr. Paul Eber, der Schüler, Freund und Amtsgenosse der Reformatoren* (Heidelberg: Universitätsbuchhandlung von Karl Winter, 1843); idem, *Paul Eber. Ein Stück Wittenberger Lebens aus den Jahren 1532 bis 1569* (Ansbach: Verlag von Friedrich Seybold, 1857); Th. Pressel, *Paul Eber. Nach gleichzeitigen Quellen* (LASLK 8) (Elberfeld: Verlag von R.L. Friderichs, 1862); D.G. Buchwald, *D. Paul Eber. Der Freund, Mitarbeiter und Nachfolger der Reformatoren. Ein Bild seines Lebens und Wirkens* (Leipzig, 1897); Janse, *Hardenberg*, index, and 534 (Eber's correspondence with Hardenberg); biographical articles in *ADB* 5 (1877): 529-531; *RE*³ 5 (1898): 118-121 and 23 (1913): 361; *RGK* 2 (1958, repr. 1986): 296; *NDB* 4 (1959): 225; *OER* 2 (1996): 17.

16 Calvin, "Petit traité de la sainte cene de nostre Seigneur Iesus Christ (...)" (Genève: Michel du Bois, 1541), in P. Barth et al., eds., *Joannis Calvini, Opera Selecta* 1 (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1926, repr. 1963): 499-530 (abbr. as *OS*).

17 As to this process: H. Schilling, ed., *Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland—Das Problem der "Zweiten Reformation". Wissenschaftliches Symposium des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte 1985* (SVRG 195) (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1986); idem, *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society*:

(continued...)

an influence, as we shall see, mediated through Hardenberg — on the profilation of Philippism and the rise of the German reformed confession. I will (1) characterize Melanchthon's later teachings on the Lord's Supper, (2) indicate Wittenberg's involvement in the controversies surrounding the Lord's Supper in Bremen, (3) deal with Peucer's and Eber's Eucharistic writings of 1560, and (4) provide a conclusion.

1. *Characteristics of Melanchthon's Eucharistic doctrine from the 1540s onwards*

Current research into what was unique in Melanchthon's views on the Eucharist in the 1540s, what distinguished them from Luther's doctrine, can be summarised in five points:¹⁸

1. Whereas Luther emphasises the ubiquity of Christ's body, Melanchthon underlines its locality — in heaven — as did Zwingli and Calvin. In contrast to the latter, Melanchthon taught the *ubivoli* presence: the Lord can be present in his Supper whenever he wishes.
2. The presence of the Lord brought about by the words of consecration is rejected as magic: Christ's promise is sufficient. "By the word" (*per verbum*) becomes "according to the word" (*iuxta verbum*).
3. In line with the *Wittenberg Concord* of 1536 and the *Augsburg Confession* (the *Variata*) of 1540, Christ is given *cum* ("with") the bread and wine. The "est" of the words of the institution ("Hoc est corpus meum") has to be explained on the basis of I Cor. 10, 16: "The bread that we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?". The local inclusion of consubstantiation is rejected.
4. The above derives from Melanchthon's perception of the real presence as a personal presence: body and blood are not parts of Christ but the entire living Lord. As he promises throughout the New Testament, that he will be present to believers, Christ can be personally present in his Supper even though he is seated at God's right hand.
5. The consequences of an oral eating, something which even unbelievers can do, are avoided by Melanchthon owing to his doctrine of a

17 (...continued)

Essays in German and Dutch History (SMRT 50) (Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1992): 205-301; W. Sparr, "Zweite Reformation und Traditionalismus. Die Stabilisierung des Protestantismus im Übergang zum 17. Jahrhundert", in *Pirckheimer Jahrbuch* 6 (1991): 117-131.

18 Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre", 51f. Cf. idem, *Abendmahlslehre Melanchthons*, 339-398; H. Gollwitzer, *Coena Domini. Die altlutherische Abendmahlslehre in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Calvinismus, dargestellt an der lutherischen Frühorthodoxie. Mit einer Einführung zur Neuausgabe von Dietrich Braun* (TB, Systematische Theologie 79) (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, (1937) 1988), 65-96; Janse, *Hardenberg*, 306f.

manducatio spiritualis and *ceremonialis*, a spiritual eating linked with a ceremonial eating. Christ is not present in the elements but *in actu*, in the action of the Lord's Supper and is thereby present for those taking part. In contrast to Zwingli and Calvin, however, he rejects the necessity of prior belief for reception of the gift. He maintains Luther's pastoral maxim, that the Lord's Supper can only serve as a consolation if human conditions do not need to be fulfilled.

In summary: "Melanchthon stands between Luther and Calvin. With Luther he teaches the unconditional nature of the gift of the Lord's Supper, but avoids Luther's catholicizing formulations and practices. He joins Zwingli and Calvin in taking a clear distance from Catholicism, but he does not share their spiritualism in their teaching on the Lord's Supper".¹⁹

2. Wittenberg's involvement in the controversies in Bremen surrounding the Lord's Supper, 1555-1561

This view of the Lord's Supper left Wittenberg room to find common ground with the reformed protestants. Thus, for example, the Bremen cathedral preacher already alluded to, Hardenberg, rightly made continual appeals to his friends in Wittenberg, from 1548 onwards, for theological protection in his conflict with his gnesio-Lutheran colleagues over the real presence and the ubiquity.²⁰

It was only with a great deal of caution that Melanchthon took on this role of protector.²¹ What caused him to nail his theological colors to the mast — starting towards the end of 1556 — was, as I have mentioned elsewhere,²² his indignation at the new Christology preached by Johann Brenz. Hardenberg was mediator in informing Melanchthon of Brenz's doctrine of the *ubiquitas absoluta* of Christ's human nature even before publication by Brenz in 1557. For when, in October/November 1556, the Bremen Lutheran Johann Timann produced like a *deus ex machina* a manuscript on the Lord's Supper written by Brenz as support for his doctrine of the ubiquity, a document containing

19 Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre", 52.

20 Janse, *Hardenberg*, 301f.

21 *Ibid.*, 302-304.

22 W. Janse, "Das 'Extra Calvinisticum' in Melanchthons Vorlesungsdiktat zu Kolosser 3,1 vom Juni 1557", in H. Rudolph/H.J. Selderhuis, eds., *Pietas Bataviensis. Festgabe für Marijn de Kroon zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (Münster/Zwolle, 1993) (written for restricted circulation only); cf. Janse, *Hardenberg*, 51f., 333-337.

Brenz's Christological neology,²³ with which Timann, in fact, replaced the traditional foundation of the real presence, namely the words of the institution,²⁴ Hardenberg warned his friend in Wittenberg²⁵ and Melanchthon arose from his slumbers.

In order to grasp the significance of the documents that are the ultimate object of the present contribution, we need to follow Melanchthon and Eber closely from this moment. I would divide the drama into six acts.

1. In the December of 1556 both men gave their fiat (though only in private) to Hardenberg's introduction of the doctrine of the *Extra Calvinisticum* as Christological basis for the simultaneity of the *sessio ad dextram* and the personal presence in the Lord's Supper.²⁶
2. A month later, in his capacity as author of the *Wittenberger Gutachten*, Melanchthon took sides in the Bremen conflict, taking up a stance against the *communis opinio* in Lower Saxony, by rejecting the essential identity of the bread and wine with Christ's body and blood.²⁷
3. In June 1557 he gave a lecture on Colossians 3, 1 in which he adopted the teaching of the *Extra Calvinisticum*, quoting Hardenberg almost word for word. Publication of the lecture in 1559 meant

23 Most likely the chapter "De Eucharistia" of the "Posterior pars secundae pericopes (...)" of the "Apologia Confessionis Illustrissimi Principis ac Domini, D. Christophori, Ducis Wirtenbergensis, etc." (1557), in J. Brenz, *Operum reverendi et clarissimi theologi, D. Ioannis Brentii* (...) 8 (Tubingae: Georgius Gruppenbachius, 1590): 507-512.

24 Johann Timann to Daniel von Büren, [October/November, 1556], in [E. Wagner], *Doctor Albert Hardenbergs im Dom zu Bremen gefüretes Lehramt und dessen nächsten Folgen* (Bremen: Diedrich Meier, 1779): 69 note d, and G.J. Planck, *Geschichte der Entstehung, der Veränderungen und der Bildung unseres protestantischen Lehrbegriffs vom Anfang der Reformation bis zu der Einführung der Konkordienformel* 5/1 (Leipzig: Siegfried Lebrecht Crusius, 1798): 155 note 221.

25 Hardenberg to von Büren, [October/November, 1556], in Staatsarchiv Bremen, 2-T.1.c.2.b.2.c.2.a.1; von Büren to Melanchthon, November 23, 1556, in D. Gerdes, *Miscellanea Groningana in miscellaneorum Duisburgensium continuationem publicata* 3/3 (Groningae: Hajo Spandaw, 1742): 374-382.

26 Eber to Hardenberg, December 5, 1556, in C.A. Salig, *Vollständige Historie der Augspurgischen Confession und derselben Apologie* 3 (Halle, 1735): 731 note o; Melanchthon to Hardenberg, December 6, 1556, in CR 8: 917f. Hardenberg's writing: "Themata, sive Positiones, adversus Ubiquitatem corporis Christi, in Farragine Johannis Amsterodami plus XXXVIII locis repetitam" (November 5, 1556), in *De Ubiquitate, Scripta Duo Adversaria Doct. Alberti Hardenbergii et Elardi Segebadii* (...), *Item Alberti Hardenbergii, brevis et aperta controversiae de Eucharistia explicatio* (Myloecii: Petrus Fabricius, 1564): 4^b-7^a. Cf. Janse, *Hardenberg*, 56-58, 123-127.

27 Wittenberg to the Bremen Council, January 10, 1557, in CR 9: 15-18. Cf. Janse, *Hardenberg*, 59-61.

permanent stigmatisation for Melanchthon.²⁸

4. In a letter written in March 1559 and published in 1561, Melanchthon went so far as to join the Greek Fathers in typifying the bread and wine as symbols, as antitypes or figures of Christ's body and blood.²⁹
5. For the first time on November 1st, 1559 Melanchthon openly entered the conflict over the Lord's Supper in his famous Heidelberg *Iudicium* to Frederick III, published posthumously. Bremen, Heshusen, Mörlin, and Sarcerius were all named and blamed for their teachings on consubstantiation and transubstantiation, and for their "artolatry" (worship of bread).³⁰
6. A month later, in December 1559, Tileman Heshusen was summoned to Bremen to become superintendent. Heshusen made his acceptance of the appointment conditional on his being permitted to engage in a dispute with the dissident Hardenberg. Heshusen wanted Mörlin and Westphal as seconds. His cynical recommendation to Hardenberg was: seek the aid of no-one less than Calvin, Bullinger and the reformed city of Emden.³¹ Finally, Melanchthon responded to the urgent pleas of the disconsolate Hardenberg and offered his services as second. He recommended that Hardenberg should call on the aid of Petrus Martyr.³² Melanchthon's offer has been justifiably called "a sensation": he was to join with a Swiss to cross swords with Heshusen, Westphal and Mörlin and would document his sympathy for the Swiss.³³ But three weeks before the Dispute, on April 19th, 1560, Melanchthon died. Hardenberg was declared a "Zwinglian". Melanchthon escaped a similar fate thanks only to his death. Support by Peucer and Eber³⁴ was unable to prevent Hardenberg from being

28 Janse, *Hardenberg*, 315-319; cf. Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre", 54f. and E.K. Sturm, *Der junge Zacharias Ursin. Sein Weg vom Philippismus zum Calvinismus (1534-1562)* (BGLRK 33) (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1972), 73-82.

29 See note 7.

30 See note 10.

31 Alexander Bruchsal to Joachim Westphal, December 23, 1559, in C.H.W. Sillem, *Briefsammlung des Hamburgischen Superintendenten Joachim Westphal aus den Jahren 1530 bis 1575 2* (Hamburg: Lucas Gräfe und Sillem, 1903): 408.

32 Melanchthon to Hardenberg, February 29, 1560, in CR 9: 1062f.

33 W.H. Neuser, "Hardenberg und Melanchthon. Der Hardenbergische Streit (1554-1560)", in *JGNKG* 65 (1967): 186.

34 Eber to Hardenberg, October 6, 1560, in D. Gerdes, *Scrinium Antiquarium sive Miscellanea Groningana nova ad Historiam Reformationis Ecclesiasticam praecipue spectantia* (...) 4/2 (Groningae/Bremae: Corn. Barlinkhof/G.W. Rump, 1755): 721f.; Peucer to Hardenberg, October 7, [1560], in Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek

(continued...)

banned in Braunschweig in the February of the following year, a ban which labelled him as a "mockers and insulter" of the *Augsburg Confession*.³⁵

3. *The 1560 Eucharistic writings of Peucer and Eber*

It is not difficult to demonstrate that Peucer's and Eber's writings are linked to the Bremen controversy. The extract from Peucer's letter (in the manuscript) is superscribed: "Sent from Wittenberg to Dr. Albert Hardenberg shortly before the death of Mr. Philippus Melanchthon".³⁶ Apparently, it was to serve as a support in the Dispute with Heshusen. Eber's *De coena Domini* of December 28th, 1560 — an attestation for Elector August, written at the latter's request, by way of preparation for the Electors' gathering in Naumburg in January 1561³⁷ — attacks the Eucharistic confession of the orthodox party in the Bremen conflict (1556).³⁸ The whole attestation shows signs of Hardenberg's influence, as we shall soon see.

What do they contain? Peucer notes the existence of no more than two interpretations of the words of the institution: these are the tropic, that is, "that held by Paul and the whole of the early Church" up to the time of

34 (...continued)

Bremen, Ms. a. 10, no. 99; Eber to Paul Pretorius, January 9, 1561, in Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Chart. A 125, 56^r-57^r.

35 Janse, *Hardenberg*, 78-89.

36 AMS, AST 181/10, 99^r: "D. Alberto Hardebergo Witeberga missum sub mortem Domini Philippi Melanthonis". The manuscript differs slightly from the 1596 edition (see note 13) and has an alternative conclusion (AMS, AST 181/10, 101^r): "Denique nova prorsus, et veteri Ecclesiae ignota haec posterior disputatio, cuius somnia inuenta in Ecclesiam et sparsa temporibus Caroli magni paulatim radicibus actis creverunt: sicuti libri Scholasticorum testantur. Utra igitur sit praeferenda et sequenda, relinquitur Doctorum iudicio".

37 Cf. Pressel, *Eber*, 60.

38 I.e., the "Bekandtnis der Prediger zu Bremen, vom Abendmal Christi, Anno LVI" [October 21, 1556], in T. Heshusius, *Das Jesu Christi warer Leib und Blut, im heiligen Abendmal gegenwertig sey, wider den Rottengeist zu Bremen Doc. Albert Hardenberg* (Magdeburg: Wolff Kirchener, 1560): D4^b-E1^b; and in Salig, *Vollständige Historie* 3: 725f.; as to this confession: Janse, *Hardenberg*, 53, 211f. Compare, e.g., the allusion of AMS, AST 181/10, 103^r: "Hoc cum profiteamur et doceamus, miramur istos litigiosos per vim nobis extorquere velle ἀκυρολογίας illas insulas, et mysterio huic sacrosancto minime convenientes formas, 'Panis est corpus Christi essentiale, et sumitur ore corporali corporaliter et carnaliter', praesertim si sine omni interpretatione illas simpliciter ut sonant, accipi volunt" (cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 296f.) to the Bremen "Bekandtnis", in Heshusius, *Das Jesu Christi warer Leib und Blut*: D4^b: "Zum ersten, gleuben, leren und bekennen wir, auff's einfeltigst, nach laut der klaren und deutlichen worte Christi, die on einige deutung schlecht als sie lauten an zunemen sind, Das Brod und Wein im Abendmal Christi (...), sey der warhaftige, wesentliche gegenwertige Leib und Blut Christi (...), nicht allein Geistlich, sondern auch mündlich zu essen, und (...) zu trincken ...".

Charlemagne, and "the more recent", that is, the literal interpretation, which laid the foundations for papistic aberrations.³⁹ Agricola and Westphal are blamed alongside John Damascene and Lombard.⁴⁰ The main objection voiced against them is that they draw attention away from the aim of the real presence to its mode.⁴¹ Eber mounts a passionate attack on both high points of the more recent opinion, i.e., the essential identity of sign and gift — including transubstantiation, consubstantiation, and local inclusion — and the "prodigious ubiquity of Christ's body" as its underlying Christological assumption.⁴² Westphal and Flacius Illyricus are more Catholic than the Pope in that they need, in order to uphold the real presence, the "miraculous" omnipresence, whereas for the Papists Christ's omnipotence was sufficient.⁴³

What are the personal viewpoints of Peucer and Eber? To begin with, they repeat Melancthon's notions, and they do that unreservedly and belaboured. There is a noticeable use of the concepts of *exhibitio* and *mysterium*, reminiscent of Bucer: the signs are not empty but exhibitiv, that is, they give what they promise, even though Christ's presence remains "a mystery".⁴⁴ But there are two new factors.

39 AMS, AST 181/10, 99^r-100^r; Peucer, *Tractatus historicus*: 105-107.

40 AMS, AST 181/10, 100^{r-v}; Peucer, *Tractatus historicus*: 107f.

41 AMS, AST 181/10, 100^r: "Denique in eo occupantur omnes, ut non tam ostendant, quomodo homini se communicet Christus, propter quem adest huic sacramento: quam quomodo se iungat pani et lateat in pane: quasi propter panem et non propter hominem sacramentum institutum sit"; cf. Peucer, *Tractatus historicus*: 107. AMS, AST 181/10, 100^v-101^r: "Ab his tamen maximis rebus, quibus continetur consolatio conscientiarum universa, abducitur animus illis disputationibus inextracibilibus, quibus quaeritur, Quomodo, et quam diu corpus sit in pane et speciebus panis. Omittitur enim quod praecipuum est, quomodo et quo cum fructu corpus et sanguinem Christi praesens distribuatur in coena: et quomodo per usum et sumptionem externorum symbolorum, cum accedit fides, habitet in nobis, inserat nos tanquam surculos corpori [101^r] suo, et vivificet nos ad vitam aeternam: cuius insertionis ac consotiationis cum ipso, testem esse hanc sumptionem voluit"; cf. Peucer, *Tractatus historicus*: 108.

42 "De coena Domini", in AMS, AST 181/10, 101^v-108^v; Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 292-311.

43 Ibid., 103^v-104^v; Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 298-302.

44 E.g., ibid., 103^v: "Scimus sacramentum et mysterium institutum esse admirabilissimum, in quo etsi sumptio est visibilis et corporalis rerum, quas voluit Christus ad exhibitionem corporis et sanguinis sui destinare: tamen os et dentes corpus Christi nec accipiunt corporaliter, ut isti loquuntur, nec comminuunt. Homini exhibetur, non corpori aut ventri" (cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 298); ibid., 102^v-103^r: "Qualis autem sit exhibitionis et praesentiae modus, cum sit revera in[103^r]pervestigabilis, inquirere et investigare nolumus, sed affirmanti et vere exhibenti veraci et omnipotenti Domino reverenter credimus" (cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 298); ibid., 106^{r-v}: "Cum Paulus dicit: 'Panis quem frangimus, communicatio seu participatio est [106^r] corporis Christi' [1 Cor. 10, 16], nos quoque dicimus sumpto pane et vino, vere (continued...)

First of all there is the emphasis on the role of the communicant's faith. On this point Melanchthon took up a position between Zwingli and Luther.⁴⁵ On the one hand he did not spiritualise the gift of the Lord's Supper to the extent that only believers could communicate and that faith became a condition, as did the Swiss. On the other hand, unlike Luther, he did not tie the gift so tightly to the elements that faith merely demonstrated the salvific reception of the gift. If Melanchthon thus deprived faith of any causal significance, he attributed to it an applicative significance, rejecting the notion of *manducatio impiorum*: the promise was for all, but its application was exclusively for believers.⁴⁶

Two things should be noted here. First, that Peucer and Eber place great emphasis on this applicative significance, presumably as a defence against an increasing sacramental automatism. A few quotes: "[Our] insertion and vivification does not take place without reflection and faith, as when a mouse gnaws bread";⁴⁷ "The application of the promise occurs with the use of the symbols by faith";⁴⁸ "By the use of the external symbols, when accompanied by faith, he [i.e., Christ] lives in us";⁴⁹ "We do not doubt (...) that he witnesses that he will apply his blessings to those who believe";⁵⁰ "If the participation in, or union with Christ is to be salvific and vivifying, faith must enter into play";⁵¹ "We do not wish to regard the application as being *ex*

44 (...continued)

exhiberi et sumi corpus et sanguinem Christi ..." (cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 306); *ibid.*, 107^r: "Haec omnia testantur sensisse Hilarium, quod his rebus pane et vino sumptis, sumatur in mysterio verum corpus, et verus sanguis Christi, atque ita vere adsit Christus et sit efficax" (cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 308).

45 Cf. Neuser, *Abendmahlslehre Melanchthons*, 273-277, 339-398, esp. 386ff.; *idem*, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre", 59.

46 Cf., e.g., Melanchthon, "Iudicium de controversia de coena Domini", in *CR* 9: 962, and *MWA* 6: 484.30-32, 485.12-14.

47 AMS, AST 181/10, 99^r: "Sed haec insertio et vivificatio non fit sine cogitatione et fide, ut cum mus rodit panem". In Peucer, *Tractatus historicus*: 106, the words "ut cum mus rodit panem" are lacking. Cf. Melanchthon, "Iudicium", in *CR* 9: 962 and *MWA* 6: 484.31f.: "et quidem non sine cogitatione, ut cum mures panem rodunt".

48 AMS, AST 181/10, 100^v: "cum in sumptione symbolorum fide fit applicatio promissionis"; cf. Peucer, *Tractatus historicus*: 108.

49 *Ibid.*, 100^v: "et quomodo per usum et sumptionem externorum symbolorum, cum accedit fides, habitet in nobis"; Peucer, *ibid.*

50 "De coena Domini", in AMS, AST 181/10, 101^v: "Et non dubitamus (...) testari, se applicare credentibus sua beneficia"; Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 293.

51 *Ibid.*, 106^r: "Ac ut antea diximus, fidem accedere oportere, ut sit salutaris et vivifica participatio, seu cum Christo consociatio"; cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 306f.: "ac ut antea diximus, fidem accipere oportere, ut sit ...".

opere operato (...): it is received through faith";⁵² finally: "By the clear and visible witness of the Meal, God wishes to show the promise to all, but only apply it to those who embrace it with faith".⁵³

The role of faith, however, is given such great emphasis — and that is the second remarkable feature — that faith gradually starts to take on a causal significance, as it does for Calvin and the Swiss. In other words, it is a precondition, a prior necessary instrument or *ὄργανον*. It is not only the application but also the exhibition which is exclusively for believers. I quote: "He distributes his body and blood to the believers";⁵⁴ "[The gift] is truly exhibited and applied to the believers";⁵⁵ "Because faith, as witness Hebrews [11, 1] is the *ὑποστασις* or expectation of the things we hope, and the *ἐλεγχος*, i.e., the certain proof of things we cannot see, let it bring forth light in the use and exhibition thereof, and let it, hoping in the words of him who is true and promises surely, be as an *ὄργανον* a receiver of things which, while invisibly exhibited, are nonetheless absolutely truly exhibited".⁵⁶ The quotation from the Eucharistic canon of Nicea recalls Calvin's *sursum corda*: "Let us not focus our attention on the bread and the cup on the divine table, but let us, raising our mind WITH FAITH, reflect that on that table lies the Lamb of God".⁵⁷ It would seem that here faith is not only *effectus* but also *causa efficiens*. The Calvinist notion that the Lord's Supper serves to reinforce faith already present would seem to agree with this: "The principal fruit and the main benefit of the Meal is that this witness strengthens faith".⁵⁸

52 Ibid., 107^v-108^r: "Affirmamus coenam hanc testimonium esse applicationis, quod non in[108^r]telligi volumus, ut Monachi loquuntur, ex opere operato, id est, sine bono motu utentis in adultis, sed cum fide accipiunt"; cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 310.

53 Ibid., 108^r: "vult etiam illustri testimonio visibili omnibus ostendere promissionem, et iis applicare, qui eam fide amplectuntur, id est, testificari, quod promissio ad ipsos pertineat"; cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 310.

54 AMS, AST 181/10, 99^v: "distribuit credentibus (...) suum corpus et sanguinem"; Peucer, *Tractatus historicus*: 106.

55 As in the extract "De sacra coena", in CR 9: 1089: "de re signata, quae vere exhibetur et applicatur credentibus ...".

56 "De coena Domini", in AMS, AST 181/10, 103^v: "Ac ut fides, teste Epistola ad Ebreaeos [11, 1] *ὑποστασις* est seu expectatio rerum sperandarum, et *ἐλεγχος*, id est, certum argumentum non apparentium: ita haec in sumptione [MS.: sumptiona] illa et exhibitione praeleueat, et innixa verbis veracis et certo promittentis, velut *ὄργανον* sit excipiens res, invisibiliter quidem, verissime tamen exhibitas"; Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 298.

57 Ibid., 106^v: "Sic Synodus Nicena inquit: 'Non attendamus ad panem et poculum in divina mensa propositum, sed mentem attollentes FIDE, cogitemus iacere in ea mensa agnum Dei'; cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 307.

58 Ibid., 108^r: "Fructus igitur et usus coenae principalis est, hoc testimonium fidem confirmare ..."; cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 310: "Fructus igitur et usus coenae principalis est, hoc testimonio fidem confirmare ...".

This gives rise to a problem, unique to the spiritualistic concept.⁵⁹ The Lord's Supper, say Peucer and Eber, brings about communion with or insertion into the body of Christ because faith embraces the promise, in the same way as God brings the Church together: namely through the proclamation of the promise and the acceptance of the promise in faith.⁶⁰ If incorporation into the body of Christ, the Church, through faith, is both fruit of the Lord's Supper and prior condition, the following question arises: what is the added value of the Lord's Supper over and above the proclamation of the Word? What does the believer derive from the Lord's Supper that he has not already received through faith?

The second new element in the Wittenberg Eucharistic doctrine in 1560 is that for Eber, as for Calvin, the sacrament has an extra element over and above the proclamation, thereby distinguishing both of these men from the Swiss spiritualism and placing them, like Bucer, between Zurich and Wittenberg. Communion with Christ refers not just to his Spirit or blessings. Without clarifying how, and with an appeal to the "mystery", Eber suggests that not just Christ as a person but his real substantial body and blood are present and received. Although Christ remains bodily present in heaven, he has named the bread his body "so that we should believe even more firmly that, when we partake of the bread and wine, we become absolutely truly participants in his true and substantial body, assured of this by a most precious pledge".⁶¹

59 Cf. F. Wendel, *Calvin. Ursprung und Entwicklung seiner Theologie* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1968), 313-315.

60 Cf. AMS, AST 181/10, 100^v-101^r: "Omittitur enim quod praecipuum est, quomodo et quo cum fructu corpus et sanguinem Christi praesens distribuatur in coena, et quomodo per usum et sumptionem externorum symbolorum, cum accedit fides, habitet in nobis, inserat nos tanquam surculos corpori [101^r] suo, et vivificet nos ad vitam aeternam, cuius insertionis ac consociationis cum ipso, testem esse hanc sumptionem voluit"; cf. Peucer, *Tractatus historicus*: 108. "De coena Domini", in AMS, AST 181/10, 106^v: "dicimus sumpto pane et vino, vere exhiberi et sumi corpus et sanguinem Christi. Ac ut antea diximus, fidem accedere oportere, ut sit salutaris et vivifica participatio, seu cum Christo consociatio" (cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 306f.); *ibid.*, 107^v-108^r: "Affirmamus coenam hanc testimonium esse applicationis, quod non in[108^r]telligi volumus (...) ex opere operato, id est, sine bono motu utentis in adultis, sed cum fide accipiunt. Nam cum colligat Deus Ecclesiam edita promissione, et tantum illi fiant haeredes vitae aeternae, qui promissioni credunt, vult etiam illustri testimonio visibili omnibus ostendere promissionem, et iis applicare, qui eam fide amplectuntur, id est, testificari, quod promissio ad ipsos pertineat. Fructus igitur et usus coenae principalis est, hoc testimonium fidem confirmare, et statuere, quod hoc tanquam pignore seu sigillo corporis et sanguinis sui Filius Dei se tibi applicare sua beneficia testetur. (...) Et prodest sumptio, cum fides haec intuetur" (cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 310f.).

61 "De coena Domini", in AMS, AST 181/10, 107^v: "Et de modo praesentiae et exhibitionis non curiose disputamus. Testamur etiam improbare nos eos, qui negant adesse et sumi in coena verum et substantiale corpus Christi" (cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 309f.); *ibid.*, 102^{r-v}: "Fatemur autem abhorrere nos a prodigiosa illa (continued...)

Here, seemingly, Eber is quoting Calvin's *Petit traité de la sainte cene*. "If", says Calvin, "we receive the sacrament in faith according to the Lord's command, we are truly made participants in the very substance of the body and blood of Christ".⁶² Calvin wrote this in 1541, under the influence of Bucer, in order to mediate between Luther and Zurich. His use of the concept of substance (probably borrowed from Bucer) meant a terminological step in Luther's direction, but Calvin avoided the latter's materialising approach by his own appeal to the role of the Holy Ghost as the *modus quo* of the participation in the substance of Christ's body.⁶³

This writing of Calvin's had earlier, and anonymously, played a part in the Bremen conflict. As early as 1548 Hardenberg had adopted parts of Calvin's *Short tract*, probably because of the *lutherfreundliche* concept of substance, had omitted to mention Calvin's name and had submitted it as his own Eucharistic doctrine to the Lutheran authorities in Bremen.⁶⁴ The fact that they accepted it as his *testimonium puritatis doctrinae* does not actually so much bear witness to confessional generosity, but more to a lack of doctrinal insight. Wittenberg had a copy of this plagiarism of Calvin's work.⁶⁵ I now suspect that Eber quoted Calvin via Hardenberg. This would seem to be so,

61 (...continued)

Ubiquitate corporis Christi, quae nec necessaria est ad retinendam aut propugnandam veri corporis et sanguinis Christi in coena *κοινωνίαν* ac participationem, nec congruit testimoniis divinis ullis, affirmantibus, assumptum esse a filio Dei corpus humanum verum, et id tale mansisse etiam postquam resurrexit, et gloriose ad coelos ascendit. (...[102']...) Alius enim verior et certior defensionis nervus est Christi domini veracis et omnipotentis institutio et asseveratio, qua affirmat cum pane et vino corpus et sanguinem suum se nobis exhibere adeo certo, ut propter hanc evidentiam ac certitudinem participationis, ipsum panem visibilem, suum corpus, vinum sanguinem suum appellavit: (...) ut eo firmitus credamus, nos sumpto vero pane et vino, verissime participes fieri veri et substantialis corporis et sanguinis sui, eoque confirmati preciosissimo pignore" (cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 294-296).

62 Calvin, "Petit traité de la sainte cene", in *OS* 1: 529: "Nous confessons doncq (...), que en recevant en Foy le Sacrement, selon l'ordonnance du Seigneur, nous sommes vrayment faictz participans de la propre substance du corps et du sang de Iesus Christ".

63 G.P. Hartvelt, *Verum corpus. Een studie over een centraal hoofdstuk uit de avondmaalsleer van Calvijn* (Delft: Meinema, 1960), 160-164; Janse, *Hardenberg*, 475.

64 Janse, *Hardenberg*, 33, 200-204, 471-477. Hardenberg's "Sententia de praesentia corporis domini in cena quam Senatui obtuli in hanc formam anno 1548 cum iam concionatores Bremae me persequi cepissent", [Bremen, January 14], 1548, in *ibid.*: 472-474. The passage in Calvin's "Petit traité de la sainte cene" on the participation in the very substance of the body and blood of Christ (see note 62) runs in Hardenberg's "Sententia", 474 as follows: "Credo igitur et doceo quod cum iuxta Domini institutum sacramentum fideliter et ex ipsius mandato percipimus nos substantiae etiam corporis Christi et sanguinis vere fieri participes".

65 Hardenberg to Melanchthon, [after January 14], 1548 (apograph), in Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Clm 10351, no. 11, 24^v; Melanchthon to Hardenberg, [February 6, 1548] (apograph), in *ibid.*, 24^v and Clm 10351, no. 20, 39^f; cf. Janse, *Hardenberg*, 33, 312, 510.

not only because a particular addition to Calvin's work, made by Hardenberg, is also to be found in Eber's work: immediately after the quotation taken from Calvin, and referred to above, regarding the participation in the substance of Christ's body and blood, Calvin says: "Some individuals know better than others how to explain the way in which this [participation] occurs".⁶⁶ In 1548 Hardenberg added to this passage: "But I simply teach that we really do become participants".⁶⁷ In 1560 Eber wrote: "However, we have no desire to study or to find out the way in which there is exhibition and presence, since it is, in fact, impossible to discover, but we humbly believe the true and almighty Lord who affirms and truly exhibits".⁶⁸ We are also reminded of Hardenberg in Eber's references to Irenaeus, Hilary, Cyril, Gelasius and, in particular, the Eucharistic canon of Nicea.⁶⁹ But more than anything, Eber's *De coena Domini* is filled with the spirit of his Bremen pen friend. My thesis is that it is under the influence of the Bremen conflict and of Hardenberg's part in it, that both of the Geneva *theologoumena* — i.e., the conditional nature of faith and the participation in Christ's substantial body — were incorporated into the Wittenberg view in 1560.

4. Conclusion

The fact that Eber in particular quoted Calvin via Hardenberg in his attestation, perhaps even unaware that his borrowings had their source in Geneva, could perhaps demonstrate a certain closeness to Calvin, but it still does not make the one a disciple of the other. The conclusion to Calvin's and Hardenberg's opinions on the Lord's Supper — pneumatology⁷⁰ — is not found in Eber's writing. The manner in which participation in Christ's substantial body is achieved is not elucidated. It is not ontological because of the locality of Christ's body in heaven.⁷¹ However, the reference, typical of Calvin and Hardenberg, to the role of the Holy Spirit as the author and the

66 Calvin, "Petit traicté de la sainte cene", in *OS* 1: 529: "Comment cela se faict, les uns le peuvent mieux desduire et plus clairement exposer que les autres".

67 Hardenberg, "Sententia", 474: "(nos substantiae etiam corporis Christi et sanguinis vere fieri participes. Quomodo id fiat alii aliis melius norunt explicare,) ego simpliciter doceo nos vere participare".

68 "De coena Domini", in *AMS*, *AST* 181/10, 102^v-103^r: "Qualis autem sit exhibitionis et praesentiae modus, cum sit revera in[103]pervestigabilis, inquirere et investigare nolumus, sed affirmanti et vere exhibenti veraci et omnipotenti Domino reverenter credimus"; cf. Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 296.

69 *Ibid.*, 106^v-107^r; see Hardenberg, "Sententia", 472, 474 (Irenaeus, Hilary, Nicea); cf. Janse, *Hardenberg*, index, s.v. Cyrillus, Gelasius.

70 Janse, *Hardenberg*, 226, 251f., 475f., 483f.

71 "De coena Domini", in *AMS*, *AST* 181/10, 102^r, 104^v-105^r; Cureus, *Exegesis perspicua*: 293-295, 301-303.

link of this participation is entirely absent from Eber's ideas. This lack makes Eber's point of view seem somewhat immature and incoherent and explains his rapid retreat after the criticism levelled by Elector August at the *Dresden Convention* in March 1561.⁷² It also explains the title of the present contribution: Wittenberg was "calvinizing" in 1560 without being Calvinistic.

Wittenberg's crypto-Calvinism in sacramental doctrine was known.⁷³ The fact that via the Bremen controversy also Hardenberg's influence lay behind Wittenberg's ideas and the rise of the *deutschreformiertes Kirchentum*, mainly in the persons of Melancthon and Eber, may be regarded as a modest new contribution made by this study.

⁷² Pressel, *Eber*, 61-64; *RE*³ 5 (1898): 120.

⁷³ R. Calinich, *Kampf und Untergang des Melancthonismus in Kursachsen in den Jahren 1570 bis 1574 und die Schicksale seiner vornehmsten Häupter* (Leipzig, 1866); A. Kluckhohn, "Der Sturz der Kryptokalvinisten in Sachsen 1574", in *HZ* 18 (1867): 77-127; P. Tschackert, *Die Entstehung der lutherischen und der reformierten Kirchenlehre samt ihren innerprotestantischen Gegensätzen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910, repr. 1979), 544-549; W. Friedensburg, *Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg* (Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1917), 250-345, esp. 294ff.; O. Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus* 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1927), 33-70; K. Aland, "Die Theologische Fakultät Wittenberg und ihre Stellung im Gesamtzusammenhang der Leucorea während des 16. Jahrhunderts", in L. Stern et al., eds., *450 Jahre Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg* 1 (Halle a. S.: Selbstverlag der Universität, [1952]): 180-188 = K. Aland, *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe. Alte Kirche, Reformation und Luthertum, Pietismus und Erweckungsbewegung* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1960): 332-345; Th. Klein, *Der Kampf um die zweite Reformation in Kursachsen 1586-1591* (MDF 25) (Köln/Graz, 1962); F. Lau, "Die Zweite Reformation in Kursachsen. Neue Forschungen zum sogenannten sächsischen Kryptocalvinismus", in *Verantwortung. Festschrift für G. Noth* (Berlin 1964): 137-154; E. Koch, "Der kursächsische Philippismus und seine Krise in den 1560er und 1570er Jahren", in Schilling, ed., *Reformierte Konfessionalisierung*: 60-77; H. Junghans, "Kryptocalvinisten", in *TRE* 20 (1990): 123-129, esp. 125-127; L.D. Peterson, "Philippists", in *OER* 3 (1996): 258-262; H. Junghans, "University of Wittenberg", in *OER* 4 (1996): 284-286.